



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

102

CRM-M-66991-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 29.11.2025

Karan Taaz ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Harish Bhatti, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. (482 of BNSS, 2023), has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.215 dated 30.08.2025, registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC, 1860 (repealed) and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014, at Police Station Rajpura, District Patiala.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. As per the version of the complainant, approximately Rs.40,00,000/- have been paid by the petitioner to accused persons to send the complainant's family to America. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner that he has obtained the amount for the purpose of sending the complainant to America. Learned counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the present petitioner as he is ready and willing to join the investigation.
3. Notice of motion.



CRM-M-66991-2025 (O&M)

(2)

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State and opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that there is specific allegation against the petitioner that he has received Rs.30,00,000/- in cash, and a receipt for the same has also been issued by the petitioner on his own letterhead. The petitioner is a habitual offender and is required for custodial interrogation for recovery of amount of Rs.30,00,000/-. Learned State counsel has placed on record a photocopy of order dated 03.10.2025 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-56239-2025, vide which the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner has been dismissed in another FIR. Thus, he prays for dismissal of present bail petition.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties; in order to effect proper investigation and to unearth true facts of the case, and also to recover the amount in question, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

7. Further, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as '**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806**' decided on 03.08.1997, as under:-

"....custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation orientated than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations



and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible Police Officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.
9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

29.11.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether reportable	Yes / No